25th February 1929] [Mr. S. Satyamurti]

roughly Rs. 30,000, for a bridge. They propose to carry on some portion of the work during the year. For that, they want Rs. 3,000. They say they will get Rs. 2,900 by reappropriation and they come to the Council for Rs. 100. It seems to me that the spirit of the rule of the Government of India can only mean this, that where the Government can itself act under the existing rules by reappropriation it is as well that the Government may get the approval of the Council by means of a token demand; but where, as in this case, the whole expenditure is not going to be met by reappropriation, but only a part of it, it seems to me not to be acting exactly in consonance with the spirit of the rule to put forward a token demand. As it is a new rule, and as we must be very careful that the rule is not put to uses for which it is not intended, I should like to know if the hon. the Finance Member or the hon. the Revenue Member would throw some light on this aspect of the question. I have nothing to say against the merits of the demand as it stands."

* The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—" Mr. President, Sir, the amount wanted for the current year is Rs 3,000 to begin this bridge. That can be found by reappropriation, but the bridge is a new item which the Council has not sanctioned. Therefore to give the Council an opportunity of sanctioning it, this token motion is put forward. If the Council approves this demand, this Rs. 3,000 will be spent this year, and it will then become a work in progress, and will appear in the budget for the next year.

" As regards the exact total of the estimate, I have not got information at present If we lose this season, this time of the year, it means postponing the whole work by another year."

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

VI

BILL FURTHER TO AMEND THE MADRAS CIVIL COURTS ACT, 1873.

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar:—" I move, Sir, that the Bill further to amend the Madras Civil Courts Act, 1873, be referred to a Select Committee composed of the following Members :—

1. M.R.Ry. P. T. Rajan Avargal.
2. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu Garu.
3. M.R.Ry. K. P. Raman Menon Avargal.
4. " T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar Avargal.
5. " P. C. Venkatapati Raju Garu.
6. " C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar Avargal.
7. Mr. C. E. Wood.
8. Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.
9. M.R.Ry. Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar Avargal.
10. The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar (Mover).

" With your permission, I would substitute the name of Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu Garu in place of Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro because Sir Patro does not want to serve on this committee. On the merits of the Bill, which is a thoroughly non-controversial measure, I do not think it is necessary to say anything at all."

The hon. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar :—" I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

12-30 p.m. * The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" In order to appoint the Chairman of the Committee I wish to know whether the Government want to have the Bill considered in this session."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I am not very particular, Sir. I will leave it to you. I am not in a dreadful hurry about it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I do not find Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar, one of the panel of chairmen, here and, if the Government want to have the Committee on the 27th, then I have to appoint another gentleman to the Committee."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I am not in a hurry. If you want to communicate to him you may do so. Otherwise you may be pleased to appoint any other person who is willing to serve on the Committee."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar is appointed as Chairman of the Committee."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" There is a paper handed in, Sir, suggesting a further amendment."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The amendment was not allowed."

VII

THE MIRZAPURAM AND PEDAGONNUR IMPARTIBLE ESTATES BILL.

The discussion[a] of Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi's Bill to declare the Mirzapuram and Pedagonnur estates as impartible was then resumed. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo continued his speech.

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" Mr. President, Sir, last time in the course of my speech I quoted from the Permanent Settlements Regulation of 1802 and Sannad Isthimirars to show that permanently settled estates were given not only to the then holders but also to their heirs, successors and assignees. I also quoted from the proceedings of 1903 of the Legislative Council wherein these very estates of Mirzapuram and Pedagonnur were proposed to be included in the schedule to the Impartible Estates Bill. A full-dress debate took place on it, votes were taken and the result was that they were kept off from the operation of the Act. Having said that, I now proceed to state the position of the Government as stated by the hon. the Leader of the House in his speech opposing the Kirlampudi Estate being taken under the Impartible Estates. I refer to the speech at page 319 on 31st August 1926 wherein the hon. the Revenue Member has stated that the objections of the Government of Madras regarding these estates for their inclusion in the schedule of the Impartible Estates are two :—

(1) That ancient zamindaris and estates of like nature which have descended impartible continuously from 1802, i.e., from the date of the Permanent Settlement Regulation and of which no partition since that date could be proved, are impartible ; and

(2) that the powers of the estate for the time being should be those of the managing member of a Hindu family governed by the ordinary law of succession.

" Sir, judged by these two canons that were enunciated by the hon. Gentleman I think these estates fail and miserably fail because in the very

---

[a] Please see page 635 of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council, dated 1st February, 1929.